

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/650,167	08/27/2003		John O. Marsden	97112.3000	5967
7590 09/16/2004				EXAMINER	
Wendy S. Ne			ANDREWS, MELVYN J		
Snell & Wilme One Arizona C			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
400 East Van Buren				1742	
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202				DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		r				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/650,167	MARSDEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Melvyn J. Andrews	1742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address :				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 Au</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E.	action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the d Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	pted or b) objected to by the E rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 31103&31203.	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/650,167

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,451,088. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the step of incorporating at least one seeding agent which prevents the reactive process from passivating or encapsulating a metal value by urging at least one passivating or encapsulating species to at least crystallize, precipitate or otherwise form on or in proximity to the seeding agent as defined in the specification since the specification can always be used as a dictionary MPEP 804 II. B.

Obviousness-Type

Claims 1-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,626,979. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably Application/Control Number: 10/650,167

Art Unit: 1742

distinct from each other because the step of incorporating at least one seeding agent which prevents the reactive process from passivating or encapsulating a metal value by urging at least one passivating or encapsulating species to at least crystallize, precipitate or otherwise form on or in proximity to the seeding agent as defined in the specification since the specification can always be used as a dictionary MPEP 804 II. B.

1. Obviousness-Type.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to ller et al. (US 4,399,109) and Weir (US 4,605,439) do not disclose or suggest a process for recovering a metal value comprising incorporating at least one seeding agent into the reactive process whereby partially preventing the reactive process from passivating or encapsulating at least one metal value by urging at least one passivating or encapsulating species to at least partially crystallize, precipitate or otherwise form on or in proximity to the seeding agent.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melvyn J. Andrews whose telephone number is (571)272-1239. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V King can be reached on (571)272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/650,167

Art Unit: 1742

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mja September 15, 2004 MELVYN ANDREWS PRIMARY EXAMINER